

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

LYNN MCCALLUM,	:	1:14-cv-667
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	Hon. John E. Jones III
v.	:	
	:	Hon. Gerald B. Cohn
CAROLYN COLVIN, Acting	:	
Commissioner of Social Security,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

ORDER

August 3, 2015

AND NOW, upon consideration of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Gerald B. Cohn (Doc. 12), recommending that we deny the Plaintiff's appeal from the final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying Plaintiff's claims for Social Security Insurance and, after an independent review of the record, and noting that Plaintiff filed objections,¹ which have been responded to and the Court finding Judge Cohn's analysis to be

¹ Where objections to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation are filed, the court must perform a *de novo* review of the contested portions of the report. *Supinski v. United Parcel Serv.*, Civ. A. No. 06-0793, 2009 WL 113796, at *3 (M.D. Pa. Jan. 16, 2009) (citing *Sample v. Diecks*, 885 F.2d 1099, 1106 n. 3 (3d Cir. 1989); 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(c)). “In this regard, Local Rule of Court 72.3 requires ‘written objections which . . . specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objection is made and the basis for those objections.’” *Id.* (citing *Shields v. Astrue*, Civ. A. No. 07-417, 2008 WL 4186951, at *6 (M.D. Pa. Sept. 8, 2008)).

thorough, well-reasoned, and fully supported by the record, and the Court further finding Plaintiff's objections to be without merit² and squarely addressed by Judge Cohn's report **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

1. The Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Cohn (Doc. 12) is **ADOPTED** in its entirety.
2. The Clerk of Court shall enter judgment in favor of the Commissioner and against Lynn McCallum as set forth in the following paragraph.
3. The decision of the Commissioner of Social Security denying Lynn McCallum Social Security Insurance is affirmed.
4. The Clerk of Court shall **CLOSE** this case.

s/ John E. Jones III
John E. Jones III
United States District Judge

² Plaintiff's "objections" to the R&R are clearly nothing more than the arguments presented by her in support of her appeal. In our view, the Magistrate Judge thoroughly and correctly addressed each of the material areas raised by the Plaintiff in his objections within his R&R, thus we shall not revisit those arguments herein.